

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 6-7, 19, 31, 48 and 50-52

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner rejects Claims 6-7, 19, 31, 48 and 50-52 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyashita et al. (WO 98/24271 - English equivalent, US Patent Publication No. 2002/0041926) in view of Iguchi (WO 98/27579 - English equivalent, US Patent Publication No. 2002/0009536) and Kasubuchi et al. (US 3,878,517). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, independent Claim 6 recites “discharging liquid comprising an organic light-emitting material to a pixel column over a substrate from a nozzle by contacting a contact element attached to the nozzle to a bank” (emphasis added).

As the Examiner admits, Miyashita ‘271 does not disclose this claimed feature. The Examiner, however, cites Iguchi ‘579 as showing this feature and contends that Applicants’ argument that Iguchi ‘579 does not teach discharging liquid from a nozzle by contacting a contact element to a bank is unconvincing. In support thereof, the Examiner argues that “...’579 discharges its ink while contacting a contact element to the bank. Therefore, the contact is sufficient to allow the discharge of ink.” Applicants respectfully disagree.

Iguchi ‘579 appears to disclose a paste applicator 20. This is believed to be the closest thing in Iguchi ‘579 to a nozzle.¹ The Examiner also seems to be inferring that height sensor 40 corresponds to the contact element (however, as the Examiner does not specifically identify the alleged corresponding elements in Iguchi ‘579, Applicants are forced to speculate on these

¹ The passages in Iguchi ‘579 cited by the Examiner refer to applying a phosphor paste which is done in the reference using paste applicator 20.

points).² However, in Iguchi '579, as shown in Figs. 3 and 4, the height sensor 40 is provided apart from the paste applicator 20. Hence, even if it is argued that height sensor 40 corresponds to the contact element (which as Applicants explained in their prior response, Applicants disagree that height sensor 40 is the claimed contact element), height sensor 40 is not in contact with nor is it attached to the nozzle (paste applicator 20). Hence, Iguchi '579 and the other references do not disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

With regard to dependent Claim 52, this claim recites that “the liquid comprising said organic light-emitting material is discharged through the contact element.” The Examiner states that “[i]n order for the figures to support the claim language, the nozzle itself or the ejection head as a whole must be considered to meet the limitation of a ‘contact element attached to the nozzle.’ The material is ejected through the ejection head as a whole, and therefore through the contact element.”

However, according to page 39, lns. 7-8 of the specification of the present application (while discussing Fig. 13), “[a] tube shaped part is attached to the tip of the nozzles, and this is referred to as a contact element throughout the specification.” Hence, the contact element (tube shaped part) is attached to the tip of the nozzle.

None of the cited references appear to disclose or suggest that the contact element is attached to the tip of the nozzle, and that the liquid comprising said organic light-emitting material is discharged through the contact element. Hence, this claimed element is also not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

Therefore, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest the claimed method, and the

² This speculation is one reason why Applicants continue to believe that this rejection is insufficient

claims are patentable thereover. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 26

The Examiner also rejects Claim 26 under 35 USC §103(a) over Miyashita in view of Iguchi, and Kasubuchi and further in view of Kurosawa et al. (US 6,057,647). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Claim 26 is a dependent claim. Accordingly, it is patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above for independent Claim 6. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 49

The Examiner also rejects Claim 49 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyashita in view of Iguchi and Kasubuchi and further in view of Horike (US 4,281,332). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Claim 49 is a dependent claim. Accordingly, it is patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above for independent Claim 6. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants are submitting an information disclosure statement (IDS) herewith. As a RCE

and improper.

is being filed herewith, it is respectfully requested that this IDS be entered and considered prior to the issuance of any further action for this application.


Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in an allowable condition and should be allowed.

Please charge our deposit account 50/1039 for any further fee for this response.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street
Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 26568